



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/777,353	02/05/2001	Patrick Steven Cunningham	3201P2284	5161
23504	7590	04/13/2006	EXAMINER	
WEISS & MOY PC 4204 NORTH BROWN AVENUE SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85251			KYLE, CHARLES R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/777,353	CUNNINGHAM, PATRICK STEVEN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Charles Kyle	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 8-16 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 8-16 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claims 8-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. They recite the phrase “to obtaining credit approval by a builder”. It first appears that the builder approves his/her own credit; secondly, “to obtaining” is unclear and confusing.

**Claims 8-16** recite the phrase “...and the like”, which is open-ended and indefinite.

**Claims 8-16** recite the phrase “determination of approval of construction loan”, which lacks an article, specifically “a”.

**Claims 8-16** recite the phrase “after request for payment”, which lacks an article, specifically “the”.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 8-15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0077967 *Ingram* in view of *Project Management*.

**As to Claim 8,** *Ingram et al* disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including in a method for the application and payment of construction loans between lenders and builders, steps of:

establishing a loan website (Fig. 7, para. 48) on a host server (Fig. 4, para. 48);  
selecting a desired lender from a list of lenders to obtain credit approval of a builder from the desired lender (para. 25);  
entering and submitting electronically information related to the construction project to the desired lender (para. 49);  
determination of approval of a construction loan by the desired lender (Fig. 3C, ele. 58; Fig. 11; para. 48);  
entering additional construction information if the construction loan is approved (para. 49), the construction information comprising a list of sub-contractors and suppliers, (paras. 18, 50-51);  
submitting a request for payment (Fig. 12, ele. 46; para. 49); and  
transferring monetary funds after request for payment is submitted and approved (Fig. 12, ele. 178; para. 49).

*Ingram* does not specifically disclose a budget for each sub-contractor and supplier and calculating a difference between the budget and an actual cost for each sub-contractor and supplier. *Project Management* discloses these limitations at pages 813 (Budgets) to page 830. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Ingram* to utilize the budget/variance features of *Project Management*

because this would allow responsible authorities to take action to correct problems within an original budget and bring a construction project back within acceptable financial tolerances.

See *Project Management* at page 819, at least.

**As to Claims 9 and 10,** *Ingram* discloses entering a user name and password to enter and submit electronically information related to a construction project to a lender at para. 48.

**As to Claim 11,** see the discussion of Claims 9 and 10 and *Ingram* further discloses accessing an application and submitting (updating) builder information to an electronic database at para 48 and Figs 8 and 11.

**As to Claim 12,** *Ingram* further discloses a contingency account at paras. 25 and 47. *Ingram* does not specifically disclose calculation of a budget/actual cost difference as either a surplus or deficit. *Project Management* discloses such a calculation at page 814, "Cost Variance" topic particularly. See also pages 813-830. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Ingram* to include the consideration of calculated surplus/overrun (deficit) because this would provide benefit to thrifty a sub-contractor, supplier or contract laborer as an increase to available funds based on relative savings and a penalty to an overspending sub-contractor, supplier or contract laborer as a decrease to available funds based on relative over spending relative to budget. These would enhance budgetary control. The Examiner makes these statements having worked professionally as an accountant for nine years.

**Regarding Claims 13 and 15,** *Ingram* discloses electronic entry and submission of a draw amount and submission of an affidavit (inspection) to attest to accuracy at paras. 47, 49

and 50. Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known to itemize specific drawn items for financial accounting because this would allow a mapping of cost item to expenditure.

**As to Claim 14,** *Ingram* discloses status reports on the construction project at para. 49.

**Claim 16** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2002/0077967 *Ingram* in view of *Project Management* and further in view of *Pacifica South Bancrp Construction Lending*.

**As to Claim 16,** *Ingram* discloses the invention substantially as claimed. See the discussion of claim 15. *Ingram* does not specifically disclose supply of contractor lien and affidavits from subcontractors. *Pacifica* discloses these concepts at pages 3 and 7, underlined text. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify *Ingram* to include such liens and affidavits to facilitate completion of financing processes for a construction project.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Kyle whose telephone number is (571) 272-6746. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 3624

crk  
April 7, 2006

**Primary Examiner**  
**Charles Kyle**  
**Art Unit 3624**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles J. Kyle".